

7

SECRET
 CLASSIFICATION S-E-C-R-E-T
 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
 INFORMATION FROM
 FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS

REPORT

50X1-HUM

CD NO.

COUNTRY USSR

DATE OF
INFORMATION 1951SUBJECT Economic; Technological - Machine tools, production
production

DATE DIST. 9 Jun 1951

HOW
PUBLISHED Daily newspapersWHERE
PUBLISHED USSR

NO. OF PAGES 3

DATE
PUBLISHED 2 - 14 Mar 1951SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT NO.

LANGUAGE Russian

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE
 OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50
 U. S. C. 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION
 OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PRO-
 HIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Newspapers as indicated.

CRITICIZE MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL
 OF PLANTS, TRUSTS, MINISTRIES

LABORATORY WORKERS FAIL TO PERFORM FUNCTIONS -- Moscow, Vechernyaya Moskva,
 13 Mar 51

A technological laboratory was set up at the Moscow Machine-Tool-Building
 Plant imeni Ordzhonikidze in 1950. Several machine tools were installed, and the
 more outstanding Stakhanovites were selected to work on them.

After 6 months, the laboratory showed no signs of life, although in the
 shops, there were hundreds of innovators, who were continuously finding new ways
 of raising the level of production.

Workers at the laboratory were supposed to study, theorize, and disseminate
 among workers of all shops the valuable experiences gained by innovators, and to
 incorporate new methods into technological processes. However, the laboratory's
 managerial personnel remains detached from the most important undertakings of
 Stakhanovites.

Karpov, director of the laboratory, compiles leaflets describing the experi-
 ences of Stakhanovites, which are published by the Central Bureau of Technical In-
 formation of the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building USSR. These leaflets can be
 found at any enterprise of the ministry except the Machine-Tool-Building Plant,
 imeni Ordzhonikidze.

There are many workers at the plant who have made suggestions; however, there
 is no one to consult concerning these suggestions, and this, with the existence
 of a technological laboratory right in the plant!

Krasnov, foreman of the tool shop, suggested a new method of securing hard-
 alloy blades to cutters. However, workers at the laboratory refused to test
 this method. A great deal of time went by and only through the persistent effort
 of this worker did the new method finally create some interest.

- 1 -

CLASSIFICATION

S-E-C-R-E-T**SECRET**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| STATE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NAVY | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NSRB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ARMY | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | AIR | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | FBI | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SECRETS-E-C-R-E-T

50X1-HUM

Berman, the plant's chief engineer, and Chirkin, chief technologist, resigned from the direction of the technological laboratory, although they initiated its organization.

INADEQUATE SUPPLY LOWERS PLANTS' EFFICIENCY -- Tbilisi, Zarya Vostoka, 14 Mar 51

The Tbilisi Plant imeni Kirov, Tbilisi Stanok Plant, Tbilisi Tsentrolit Plant, Yerevan Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Dzerzhinskiy, Maykop Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Frunze, Krasnodar Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Sedin, Novocherkassk Machine-Tool Plant, and other plants under the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building USSR were represented at a 2-day conference in Tbilisi.

P. Taranichev, Deputy Minister of Machine-Tool Building, delivered a speech in which he noted the achievements of various plants during 1950, but dwelled mainly on their failures.

The Tbilisi Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Kirov was not always on schedule in putting out machine tools, occasionally produced machine tools which did not satisfy consumers, and did not maintain wide application of advanced technical norms.

The Tsentrolit Plant, having fulfilled the 1950 plan in tonnage, was guilty of disrupting schedules in the delivery of castings; it permitted monetary losses due to rejects, and did not fulfill its assignment for lowering the cost of production.

The speaker cited comparative figures for work performed by the Tsentrolit Plant and other foundries. The output per thousand rubles of working capital and the output per worker at the Tsentrolit Plant, according to these figures, showed that many of its resources had not been utilized. These indexes showed that the plant lagged behind other leading enterprises in spite of equal facilities.

The speech was discussed by 19 participants.

Ya. Sikharulidze, director of the Tsentrolit Plant, acknowledged the justness of the criticism, and described measures which have been taken to improve the work at this enterprise during 1951. During the first 2 months of 1951, the plant has been working more rhythmically, exceeding its plan, and reducing the number of rejects. He also subjected the main administrations and departments of the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building to criticism for supplying the plant with inadequate and long-delayed raw and other materials.

He also charged that the ministry is not carrying out the construction of drainage canals, as a result of which the plant area is flooded. In addition, the delay in getting supplies has an adverse effect on some types of equipment.

The city division of the Zakmetallurgstroy Trust [Transcaucasus Construction Trust of Metallurgical Enterprises?] was severely criticized for consistently failing to meet its obligations to the Plant imeni Kirov and the Tsentrolit Plant.

Ye. Kelin, representative from the Novocherkassk Machine-Tool-Building Plant, described the weak connections between the departments and main administrations of the ministry and the plants. He also stated that the ministry is doing nothing about rectifying the irregular schedule of supplying parts to the cooperative plants. Motors for machine tools are flown to the plant. The cost of delivering them in this fashion exceeds the cost of the motors themselves, which in turn increases the production cost of the machine tools.

- 2 -

S-E-C-R-E-T**SECRET**

SECRETS-E-C-R-E-T

50X1-HUM

Other speakers at the conference included S. Samarchyan, director of the Yerevan Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Dzerzhinskiy; V. Yurburskiy, director of the Maykop Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Frunze; M. Sokolov, director of the Krasnodar Machine-Tool-Building Plant imeni Sedin; A. Bokeriya, director of the Tbilisi Stanok Plant; and other representatives from these plants.

BLAMES MINISTRY FOR DEFAULT IN TOOL PRODUCTION -- Kiev, Pravda Ukrainy, 2 Mar 51

All plants of the Ministry of Local Industry Ukrainian SSR cannot produce special tools, dies, fixtures, and measuring tools. They have to procure them from a centralized supply station. Back in 1946, the Ministry of Local Industry Ukrainian USSR set up a special plant, under the Ukrstankoprom /Ukrainian Machine-Tool Industry?/ Trust, for the manufacture of tools, fixtures, and dies.

This plant was built in Kiev. However, although it is called a tool plant, it does not produce tools. As formerly, enterprises of the local industry still have a desperate need for tools and fixtures.

The Ministry of Local Industry Ukrainian SSR is to blame for this situation. It has failed to solve problems in the organization of mass production of tools, has not developed a plan for redesigning the tool plant, has not determined the range of types of parts for the production of which the plant would be responsible, and has not provided the enterprise with the necessary equipment. This plant, which has been called on to aid many other plants, is itself suffering from an acute shortage of tools and lack of mechanization, and is performing many tasks by the last-minute speed-up method.

The Ukrstankoprom Trust and the dormitory for the technical machinery school are located in the most productive areas of the Kiev Tool Plant. Naturally, this hinders the development of the enterprise. In addition, the ministry itself does everything possible to divert the plant from fulfilling its basic assignment. It has, in fact, turned the plant into its own experimental base, giving it orders for the manufacture of machines, mechanisms, and machine tools having absolutely no relationship to tool production.

There is no doubt that the ministry needs such a base, and it should be developed. However, it is time that the tool plant be given the facilities for carrying out its primary function. -- A. Pavlov, director, Kiev Tool Plant

PRODUCTION COSTS VARY 100 PERCENT -- Moscow, Pravda, 9 Mar 51

During 1950, the cost of producing identical parts at various tool plants under the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building USSR was far from uniform. The cost of producing micrometers at the Kirov Krasnyy Instrumental'shchik Plant was twice the cost of manufacturing exactly the same type of micrometer at the Moscow Kalibr Plant. At other machine-tool-building plants, the losses due to rejects and other causes increased in 1950, as a result of which the plan for lowering production costs in 1950 in comparison with 1949, were not fulfilled by the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building as a whole.

- E N D -

- 3 -

S-E-C-R-E-T**SECRET**